

REMARKS

Claims 1-36, 48 and 49 are pending. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended in this response. Claims 10-25, which were previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement, have been canceled. New claims 50 and 51 have been added. Claims 1-9, 26-36, and 48-51 will therefore be pending upon entry of the above amendments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-9, 26-36, 48, and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0048899 (“the Marouiss application”).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, “wherein . . . the other of said substrate mount and said dispensing device is further adapted for movement so that an angle of orientation between said substrate mount and said dispensing device can be adjusted to maintain a parallel relationship between said surface of said substrate and said dispensing device.” Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from the Marouiss application because the Marouiss application neither teaches nor suggests these features.

Support for the amendment of claim 1 can be found in the original application at, for example, page 14, lines 3-5, which reads “the probes are linked by means of appropriate circuitry to a computer, which assists in adjusting the position and orientation of the dispensing device relative to the substrate;” page 14, lines 12-14, which reads “the angle of the dispensing device is adjusted to assure a parallel relationship between the surface of the substrate and the nozzles on the dispensing device;” page 14, lines 23-25, which reads “[a]djustments are made to the position and angle of orientation of the dispensing device and of the nozzles of the dispensing device during this calibration and set up period;” and page 33, line 32 through page 34, line 4, which reads “[a]n adjustment is made to the alignment of print head assembly 128 based on the information sent from camera 332 to the central computer, which instructs the adjustment of the print head assembly 128 to maintain a correct or parallel relationship between printing head assembly 128 and surface 11a of substrate 10.”

The sample holder (3906) and the dispense manifold (3902) of the Marouiss application have been characterized in the office action as a substrate holder and a dispensing device, respectively, as recited in claim 1 of the present application (*office action at page 2, lines 6-16*). Neither the sample holder (3906) nor the dispense manifold (3902) is adapted for movement so that an angle of orientation therebetween can be adjusted to maintain a parallel relationship between a surface of the sample holder (3906) and the dispense manifold (3902). Rather, the dispense manifold (3902) rotates about a pivot (3916) in relation to the sample holder (3906), as shown in Figures 38 and 39 of the Marouiss application. The Marouiss application contains no indication that the orientation of the pivot (3916) in relation to the sample holder (3906) can be varied. Thus, the angle of orientation between the sample holder (3906) and the dispense manifold (3902) is not adjustable to maintain a parallel relationship between a surface of the sample holder (3906) and the dispense manifold (3902).

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the Marouiss application neither teaches nor suggests a substrate mount or a dispensing device adapted for movement so that an angle of orientation between the substrate mount and the dispensing device can be adjusted to maintain a parallel relationship between a surface of a substrate and the dispensing device, in contradistinction to amended claim 1 of the present application. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 (and claims 2-9 and 48, which depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 26

Claim 26, as discussed above, has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Marouiss application. Claim 26 has been amended herein to recite, in part, “adjusting an angle of orientation of said dispensing system in relation to said substrate to maintain a parallel relationship between said surface of said substrate and said dispensing device.” Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 26 is patentably distinct from the Marouiss application because the Marouiss application neither teaches nor suggests this element.

Support for the amendment of claim 26 can be found in the original application at, for example, the passages identified above in relation to the amendment of claim 1.

The angle of orientation between the sample holder (3906) and the dispense manifold (3902) of the Marouiss application cannot be adjusted to maintain a parallel relationship between a surface of the sample holder (3906) and the dispense manifold (3902), as discussed above in relation to claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the Marouiss patent neither teaches nor suggests adjusting an angle of orientation of a dispensing system in relation to a substrate to maintain a parallel relationship between a surface of the substrate and the dispensing device, in contradistinction to amended claim 26 of the present application. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 (and claims 27-36 and 49, which depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

New Claims 50 and 51

New claims 50 and 51 have been added to further define the scope of the claimed embodiments and methods. Support for these claims can be found in the original application at, for example, the passages identified above in relation to the amendment of claim 1; and page 13, lines 21-26, which reads “[o]ne problem is that the substrates may have differences in thickness or other imperfections. Accordingly, if the dispensing device is set at a predetermined distance from the substrate on the substrate mount, the actual distance may change from one substrate to the next. In the present invention appropriate techniques are employed to provide accurate orientation of the fluid dispensing device even through variations in the substrate are present.”

A notice of allowability is respectfully requested.

Date: January 8, 2008

/Frank T. Carroll/

Frank T. Carroll
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,392

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
1101 MARKET STREET
26TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA PA 19107-2950
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189